arXiv:1509.01984v1 [quant-ph] 7 Sep 2015

Measurable criteria of generalized non-locality

Wonmin Son[1, 2] and M. S. Kim[3]
[1]*Sogang University, Mapo-gu, Sinsu-dong, Seoul 121-742, Korea*
[2]*University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX13PU, United Kingdom*
[3]*Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*
(Received September 8, 2015)

The most general class of Bell's inequalities for N-partite d-chotomic systems, with k number of obervables, is derived using the formalism of generic correlation functions, which are obtained as a fourier transformation of probability spectrums. It is found that they provide full description of the probability space together with corresponding operator decomposition for experimentally accessible local measurement settings. It turns out that the conditions for the local hidden variable (LHV) model are violated by quantum correlated states in general and they constitute the general correlation space for Bell theorem. It provides the most general constraints for the LHV model and the conditions for the quantum violation. Quantum violation is evident by maximally entangled states.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta

Introduction- Since Bell formulated an experimentally testable condition for a local realistic model of a dichotomic bipartite system [1], generalization of the theorem to an arbitrary size quantum system has become one of the most challenging topics in the study of quantum information science [2–13]. The problem is closely related to the possible characterization of macroscopic quantum systems [3], quantum key distribution schemes [9], network characterization [14] and entanglement detection in many-body systems [15–17].

Conventionally, the generalization of a local hidden variable (LHV) model was addressed in terms of "all the Bell inequalities" by Peres about two decades ago [4]. The problem has been challenged in various ways but only partial solutions are available so far [5, 6]. Particulary, the problem is important because identifying the most general class of Bell's inequalities is related with characterization of entanglement and quantum correlations [15]. However, it is usually known that the problem is highly non-trivial and is classified as an NP-hard problem since it entails the exponentially large parameter space of the probability of events.

In order to detect genuine multipartite entanglement, a family of Bell-type inequalities for N-qudit systems were derived [11]. The main idea is from Svetlichny's N-separability [7] and obtained a set of Bell inequalities up to a limited dimension, exploiting exhaustive numerical approaches [12]. In spite of this progress, the full generalization of the Bell function has not been made yet and it is unclear whether the generalization is possible using the previous approaches.

In this Letter, we provide a general method for the analytic construction of Bell correlation functions and prove that the inequalities are violated by non-trivial quantum entangled states. In this construction, it is demonstrated that well-known Bell-type inequalities can be derived from the generic form of the correlations. Consequently, the analytical condition of the LHV model is provided.

General class of Bell's inequality - The class of Bell inequalities is determined by the three parameters N, k and d; N local parties measure their systems with k possible choices of observable which result in d different measurement outcomes respectively. Once N, k and d are dertermined, we can write conditional probabilities which constitute information about the system [18]: a set of functions, which constitute a catalogue of full information, take the form of conditional probabilities $p(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_N|m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_N)$ with $1 \le \alpha_j \le d$ and $0 \le m_j \le k-1$, where α_j is an integer number indicating the measurement outcome index for a particular choice of the observable m_j. A Bell correlation function, which may be measurable experimentally, is derived from the one-to-one correspondence between the probabilities and multi-partite high-order correlation functions. With the Bell functions, we can then formulate generalized Bell inequalities.

Mapping the measurement outcomes to d different values, the most general correlation function can be written as

$$E_{n_1,n_2,\cdots}(m_1, m_2, \cdots) = \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^{N} A_j^{n_j}(m_j) \right\rangle \qquad (1)$$

where $1 \le j \le N$ is the site index. We define a shorthand notation $E_{n_1,n_2,\cdots}(m_1, m_2, \cdots) := E_{\vec{n}}(\vec{m})$. By mapping the measurement outcomes $A_j(m_j)$ to one of the complex values among the d root of unity, $A_j(m_j) = \omega^{\alpha_j(m_j)}$, the correlation function takes a complex valued number with $\omega = \exp(i2\pi/d)$ and $\alpha_j \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}$. The function *allowing predetermined values of a measurement*, is evaluated by the expectation of the measured values (outcomes)

$$E_{\vec{n}}(\vec{m}) = \sum_{\{\alpha_j\}=1}^{d} \omega^{\vec{n}\cdot\vec{\alpha}} p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) \qquad (2)$$

where $\vec{\alpha} := (\alpha_1(m_1), \alpha_2(m_2), \cdots, \alpha_N(m_k))$. $\alpha_j(m_j)$ is determined by the physical process of measurement whose full structure is *hidden* and it is usually encapsulated in the form of *abstracted variables*, conventionally denoted by λ.

It is notable that the correlation that is to be obtained from the probabilities can be defined differently in general. That is because the combination of measured values can be arranged in an arbitrary manner as there is no preferred order of indices for the outcome sequences. In order to consider the full sequences of arbitrary combinations, it is necessary to introduce extra integer index c for a type of correlation: $E_{\vec{n}_c}(\vec{m}) = \sum_{\{\alpha_j\}=1}^{d} \omega^{\vec{n}_c\cdot\vec{\alpha}} p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m})$ where $\vec{n}_c \equiv (c_1 n_1, c_2 n_2, c_3 n_3, \cdots)$ with $c_j \in \{1, -1\}$. The subscript c takes an integer value between 1 and 2^N and specifies the type of possible correlations. Subsequently, it is possible to recover all the spectra of relevant probabilities $p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) = \frac{1}{d^N} \sum_{\{n_j\}=1}^{d} \omega^{-\vec{n}_c\cdot\vec{\alpha}} E_{\vec{n}_c}(\vec{m})$ where the total number of distinguishable probabilities are $d^N k^N$. The equality provides the one-to-one correspondence between probabilities for measurement outcomes and the high-order correlations. Without any other constraints, the probability function satisfies (i) positivity $p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) \geq 0$, $\forall \alpha_j, \forall m_j$ and (ii) the normalization condition $\sum_{\{\alpha_j\}} p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) = 1$ as the correlation function is required to satisfy $|E_{\vec{n}_c}(\vec{m})| \leq 1$ and $E_{\vec{d}_c}(\vec{m}) = 1$ for any choices of $\vec{m}$ with $\vec{d}_c = (c_1 d, c_2 d, \cdots)$.

If we generalize the interdependency of the probabilities from different measurements, due to incompatibilities, it is possible to derive a Bell-type inequality in the most general situation. This is main result of this work. Using the definition, the most general Bell function $G^c_{N,k,d}$ is given by

$$G^c_{N,k,d} := \sum_{\{\alpha_j\}=1}^{d} \sum_{\{m_j\}=0}^{k-1} g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) = \sum_{\vec{n}=1}^{d-1} f(\vec{n}_c) \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^{N} \left[\sum_{m_j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{c_j n_j m_j/k} A_j^{c_j n_j}(\lambda, m_j) \right] \right\rangle + \text{c.c.} \tag{3}$$

where *c.c.* denotes complex conjugate. The coefficient $g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}$ is a real function governing the linear sum of the probabilities and $f(\vec{n}_c)$ is a complex weighting function for the correlation. For the LHV model, the average is taken over the hidden variable λ for the measurement which determines the value of the measurement function A_j.

The choice of the function $f(\vec{n}_c) \equiv f(c_1 n_1, c_2 n_2, \cdots)$ specifies the weight of each high-order correlation function in the sum and is related to the coefficient $g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}$ as

$$g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} = 2 \ \mathrm{Re} \left[\sum_{\vec{n}} f(\vec{n}_c) \omega^{\vec{n}_c\cdot(\vec{\alpha}+\vec{m}/k)} \right]. \tag{4}$$

From its fourier analysis, it is also possible to show that the choice of function $f(\vec{n}_c)$ generates all the possible combinations of the correlations $E_{\vec{n}_c}(\vec{m})$. The decomposition of the generation function is obtained when the full correlations have been taken into account. Mathematically, it means that $\sum_{m_j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{c_j n_j m_j/k} A_j^{c_j n_j}(\lambda, m_j) = 0$ when $n_j = d, \forall j$.

The decomposition of the correlation into the probabilities in Eq.(3) provides the most general correlation as it constitutes "all the Bell inequalities" [4]. The only difference of this construction from the original formulation is the condition of homogeneity. It means that the number of measurements and the dimension of each party are chosen to be identical. It can be shown that all the known Bell functions within the homogeneous condition can be derived as a special case of the function G in (3).

For the LHV constraint, the first decomposition in (3) using probabilities is directly linked to the modified version of Farkas lemma [19]. The statement is that if $\sum_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} \prod_j A_j(\alpha_j|m_j, \lambda) \leq B_{LR}$ is satisfied by all λ and the local realistic (LR) bound B_{LR} then $G^c_{N,k,d} = \sum_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) \leq B_{LR}$ where $p(\vec{\alpha}|\vec{m}) = \sum_\lambda \rho(\lambda) \prod_j A_j(\alpha_j|m_j, \lambda)$ and $\rho(\lambda)$ is a positive function, satisfying $\sum_\lambda \rho(\lambda) = 1$. In the formulation, it is straightforward that the LR bound can be obtained by the Farkas vector $g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}$ as $\max_{\vec{\alpha}} \left[\sum_{\vec{m}} g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} \right]$[21]. Therefore, the bound for the correlation $G^c_{N,k,d}$ is obtained as

$$G^c_{N,k,d} \ \leq \ B_{LR} = \max_{\vec{\alpha}} \left[\sum_{\vec{m}} g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}} \right] \tag{5}$$

which provides the most general criteria for the probabilities allowed by the LHV model. Evaluation of the bound requires the functional optimization over the measured values, and can be achieved by the specification of local parameters under the functional constraints. The analytical values can be obtained efficiently if one follows the optimal counting method described explicitly in [20].

The decomposition of the correlation function for possible local measurements under the LHV model is nonetheless trivial. It allows quantum characterization of the correlation when the coefficients $g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}$ as well as $f(\vec{n}_c)$ are appropriately chosen. In the Bell correlation function (3), the general decomposition of measurements with the weighting factor $f(\vec{n}_c)$ is obtained. In the following, we demonstrate the derivation of known Bell functions through the specification of $g^c_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}$ and $f(\vec{n}_c)$. The condition for quantum violation will follow.

Derivation of all known Bell inequalities - We first show that the function (3) reduces to the Clauser-Horne-

Shimony-Holt (CHSH)-Bell inequality [2]. By taking the generation function $g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{CHSH} = (-1)^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+m_1m_2}$, which results in $G_{2,2,2}^{CHSH} \leq 2$, according to the bound given by Eq. (5). Here, one can obtain $f_{n_1,n_2}^{CHSH} = (1-i)\delta_{n_1,1}\delta_{n_2,1}/2$. The correlation function becomes Collins-Gisin-Linden-Massar-Popescu (CGLMP) function [8] for (2,2,d)-class system when

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{CGLMP} &= (-1)^{m_1-m_2}\sum_{k=0}^{d-1}\left(1-\frac{2k}{d-1}\right) \\ &\qquad \times \delta^d(\alpha_2-\alpha_1-k-z(m_1m_2)) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where δ^d is kroneker delta function up to modulo d and $z(m_1,m_2)$ is a binary function mapping $z(0,0) = z(1,1) = z(1,0) = 0$ and $z(0,1) = 1$. It results in $G_{2,2,d}^{CGMLP} \leq \max_{\vec{\alpha}}\left[\sum_{\vec{m}} g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{CGMLP}\right] = 2$. The weighting function is given by

$$f_{n_1,n_2}^{CGMLP} = \frac{1/2}{d-1}\sum_{n=1}^{d-1}\sec\left[\frac{n\pi}{2d}\right]\omega^{\frac{n}{4}}\delta_{n_1=n}^{d}\delta_{n_2=-n}^{d} \tag{7}$$

whose detailed derivation is shown in [21]. The quantum violation of the LR bound can be found in the original works [2, 8] and can be recovered in the framework of generalized correlation formalism in an analytical way.

We demonstrate that we can derive Bell functions for multipartite systems such as Mermin and Zukowski-Brukner (ZB) functions [3, 6]. The Mermin function $G_{N,2,2}^{M}$ is obtained by assigning $g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{M} = (-1)^{\sum_j \alpha_j}\mathrm{Re}[(i)^{\sum_j m_j}]$ when we have $f^M(1) = 1/2$. From the form of $g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}$, the Mermin bound can be found as $G_{N,2,2}^{M} \leq 2^{(N-1)/2}$ for odd N and $G_{N,2,2}^{M} \leq 2^{N/2}$ for even N. Ultimately, the most general (N,2,2)-class ZB correlation can be obtained when $f^{ZB}(\vec{n}) = (1-i)/2$ as

$$G_{N,2,2}^{c,ZB} = \sum_{\{m_j\}=0}^{1} P(m_1,m_2,\cdots)c_1^{m_1}c_2^{m_2}\cdots E(m_1,m_2,\cdots) \tag{8}$$

where the parity function $P(m_1,m_2,\cdots) \in \{-1,1\}$ takes its value 1 for $[(\sum_j m_j) \mod 4] \in \{0,1\}$ and -1 for $[(\sum_j m_j) \mod 4] \in \{2,3\}$. The LR bound of the function can be found as $G_{N,2,2}^{c,ZB} \leq 2^N$ from the probability coefficient $g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{ZB} = (-1)^{\sum_j c_j\alpha_j}\mathrm{Re}[(1-i)(i)^{\sum_j c_j m_j}]$ through the maximization of $\sum_{\vec{m}} g_{\vec{m},\vec{\alpha}}$ over a proper choice of $(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\cdots)$ following its derivation in Eq.(4). A more general constraint of Bell's theorem for the class of full correlation can be obtained as one combines $G_{N,2,2}^{c,ZB}$ for all the possible $\vec{c}$ as $\sum_{c=1}^{2^N}|G_{N,2,2}^{c,ZB}| \leq 2^N$.

For the case of $(2,k,2)$-class Bell test scenario, the general correlation function has been inspected by Epping *et. al.* [13] and can take the form $G_{2,k,2}^{EKB} = \sum_{m_1,m_2}\beta_{m_1,m_2}E(m_1,m_2)$ where $E(m_1,m_2)$ is the first-order correlation function. In this case, $\beta_{m_1,m_2} \equiv f(1)\omega^{(m_1+m_2)/k} + c.c.$ such that the coefficient β can be related to the probability coefficient $g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{EKB}$ as $g_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{m}}^{EKB} = (-1)^{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}\beta_{m_1,m_2}$. Thus, the LR bound of the function is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} G_{2,k,2}^{EKB} &\leq \max_{\vec{\alpha}}\left[\sum_{\vec{m}}(-1)^{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}\beta_{m_1,m_2}\right] \\ &= 2|f(1)|\max_{\vec{\alpha}}\left[\sum_{\vec{m}}\cos(\pi\bar{\alpha})\cos\left(\theta_f+\frac{\pi\bar{m}}{k}\right)\right] \\ &= 2|f(1)|\cos\theta_f/\sin^2(\pi/2k), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \theta_f \leq \pi/2k \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha_1+\alpha_2$, $\bar{m} = m_1+m_2$ and θ_f is the phase factor of the complex function $f(1)$ as $f(1) = |f(1)|e^{i\theta_f}$. The second equation is obtained after optimization by counting the largest cosine terms. Quantum maximum of $G_{2,k,2}^{EKB,Q}$ is given by the singular value decomposition of the β matrix, $k||\beta||_2 = k^2|f(1)|$, as argued in [13].

Quantum violation - For quantum systems, the measured variables are expressed by eigenvalues of an operator whose expectation corresponds to the statistical average of measurement values. In that case, the decomposition in Eq.(3) can be represented by measurement operators whose explicit form is given by

$$\hat{A}_j(m_j) = \sum_{\alpha}\omega^{\alpha}|A_\alpha(m_j)\rangle\langle A_\alpha(m_j)| \tag{10}$$

where d-dimensional orthogonal bases $|A_\alpha(m_j)\rangle$ are chosen to satisfy $\langle A_\alpha(m_j)|A_\beta(m_j)\rangle = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}$. The bases $|A_\alpha(m_j)\rangle$ can be obtained as a linear combination of the orthogonal computational bases, $|A_\alpha(m_j)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{\beta=1}^{d}\omega^{\beta(\alpha+m_j/k)}|\beta\rangle$ where the m_j-th basis has been obtained by the phase shift of the fourier transformed state whose phase shift is distributed from 0 to $k-1$ evenly. In the sense that the measurement bases are evenly distributed in Hilbert space, the bases can constitute a maximal test. From the bases, one can show that the spectral sum of measurement operators become ladder lowering operators as

$$\sum_{m_j=0}^{k-1}\omega^{n_jm_j/k}\hat{A}_j^{n_j}(m_j) = k\sum_{\beta}|\beta\rangle\langle\beta+n_j| \equiv k\hat{J}_j^{\,n_j} \tag{11}$$

which corresponds to the n_j-th power of a lowering operator $\hat{J}_j = \sum_\beta |\beta\rangle_j\langle\beta+1|$ for a high dimensional state as $(\hat{J}_j)^{n_j}|\alpha\rangle = |\alpha-n_j\rangle$. In addition, a phase shift operator $\hat{P}_\nu$ acting on the orthogonal computational bases generates an extra phase $\hat{P}_\nu|\alpha\rangle = \omega^{-\nu\alpha}|\alpha\rangle$ and can be used for the local unitary transform on the lowering operator as $\hat{P}_\nu^\dagger\hat{J}_j^{n_j}\hat{P}_\nu = \omega^{\nu n_j}\hat{J}_j^{n_j}$. The phase shift operation is effective in order to obtain the different measurement bases that produce the correlation values beyond LR bounds.

Together with the sequence of the local phase shift operation $\hat{P}_{\nu_j}$, the generalized Bell function for a quantum state can be obtained in terms of high-order correlation functions. If there is a state whose expectation goes beyond the LR bound, the state cannot be described by the

LHV model. With the measurements and local rotations, the correlation function of a quantum state becomes

$$G^{Q}_{N,k,d} = k^{N} \sum_{\vec{n}=1}^{d-1} f(\vec{n}) \omega^{\vec{\nu}\cdot\vec{n}} \left\langle \bigotimes_{j=1}^{N} \hat{J}_j^{\,n_j} \right\rangle + \text{c.c.} \tag{12}$$

where $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \cdots)$ represents the composite components of local phase shifts at each site.

In the following, we show that the LR bound is violated by a simple symmetric quantum state with an appropriate choice of $f(\vec{n})$. When the powers of the lowering operators at each site are uniform, $n_1 = n_2 = \cdots = n$, the N-partite maximally entangled (ME) pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_\alpha 1/\sqrt{d}\ |\alpha\rangle^{\otimes N}$ gives the quantum correlation $G^{Q,ME}_{N,k,d} = k^N \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{d}\right) f(n) \omega^{(n\sum_j \nu_j)} + c.c.$ with an arbitrary local parameter ν_j representing a choice of measurements. If $\vec{\nu}$ is chosen to satisfy that $-n\sum_j \nu_j = \mathrm{Arg}[f(n)]$, the value of the quantum correlation is upper bounded by the quantum maximum for the ME state $G^{Q,ME}_{N,k,d} \leq 2k^N \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{d}\right) |f(n)| \equiv Q_M$. Thus, an appropriate specification of $f(n)$ results in the violation of LR bound

$$B_{LR} \leq Q_M = 2k^N \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{d}\right) |f(n)| \tag{13}$$

the bound B_{LR} is also determined by the function $f(n)$, as shown in (5). Therefore, the general constraint for $B_{LR} < Q_M$ can be obtained from the appropriate choice of the weighting factors. If $|f(n)|$ is either a constant function or a monotonically increasing function with respect to n/d, then a general trend of violation, $B_{LR} < Q_M$, can be obtained. Generally speaking, the values of B_{LR} determined from $f(\vec{n})$ provide the criteria for the LHV model and constitutes the generalized Bell function as long as $B_{LR} < Q_M$. Explicit criteria in a couple of special cases and their analysis can be found in [21].

As an example, the quantum upper bound of CGMLP equation for ME state can be analytically formulated. For ME state, the quantum expection of general Bell function becomes

$$2 < Q_M^{CGMLP} = \frac{4}{d-1} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{d}\right) \sec\left[\frac{n\pi}{2d}\right] \tag{14}$$

for any value of d. Thus, the state is non-local although the value is not quantum maximum. It is known that the maximal violation of the CGMLP inequality is obtained by partially entangled state. Indeed the maximum violation value can also be derived from the current formalism.

Remarks- In this work, we derived general criteria of the LHV model analytically and provided examples that violate the condition. The derivation was done through the one-to-one correspondence between the general probability space and the correlations of arbitrary high-order moments. We proved that the decomposition of the correlation function using joint probabilities gives the straightforward LR bound. The decomposition by full correlations of high-order moments can be used for non-trivial quantum violations under the provided settings of measurements. The result sheds the light on the general characterization of quantum correlation in an arbitrary number of high dimensional systems.

Acknowledgments - The authors acknowledge Mr. G. Bae and Dr Junghee Ryu for their useful discussions. This work was done with support of ICT R&D program of MSIP/IITP (No.2014-044-014- 002) and National Research Foundation (NRF) grant (No.NRF-2013R1A1A2010537). MSK thanks the UK EPSRC and the Royal Society Wolfson merit award.

---

[1] Bell J S, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).

[2] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony and R.A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969); N.D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 356 (1980);G. Svetlichny, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 3066 (1987); M. Ardehali, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 5375 (1992); N. Gisin and A. Peres, *Phys. lett. A* **162**, 15 (1992); A.V. Belinskii and N. D. Klyshko, *Phys. Usp.* **36**, 653 (1993);N. Gisin and H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, *Phys. Lett. A* **246**, 1 (1998); I. Pitowsky and K. Svozil, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 014102 (2001);C. Sliwa, *Phys. Lett. A* **317**, 165 (2003);D. Collins and N. Gisin, *J. Phys. A: Math Gen.* **37**, 1775 (2004); S.W. Lee and D. Jaksch, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 010103(R) (2009);J. Bancal, C. Branciard, N. Brunner, N. Gisin and Y. Liang, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 125301 (2012);A. Tavakoli, S. Zohren and M. Pawlowski, Preprint arXiv:1506.04331v1 (2015).

[3] N.D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).

[4] A. Peres, *Foundations of Physics* **29**, 589 (1999).

[5] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 032112 (2001).

[6] M. Zukowski and C. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 210401(2002).

[7] M. Seevinck and G. Svetlichny, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 060401 (2002).

[8] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 040404 (2002);S. Zohren and R. D. Gill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**,120406 (2008).

[9] J. Barrett, A. Kent and S. Pironio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 170409 (2006).

[10] W. Son, J. Lee and M.S. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 060406 (2006); W. Son, C. Brukner and M. S. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 110401 (2006).

[11] D. L. Deng, Z. S. Zhou and J. L. Chen, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022109 (2009); J. L. Chen, D. L. Deng, H. Y. Su, C. Wu and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 022316 (2011); J. D. Bancal, N. Brunner, N. Gisin and Y. C. Liang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 020405 (2011);A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 220402 (2015).

[12] B. Grandjean, Y.C. Liang, J. D. Bancal, N. Brunner and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 052113 (2012).

[13] M. Epping, H. Kampermann, D. Bruss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 240404 (2013).

[14] Adán Cabello, Simone Severini, and Andreas Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 040401 (2014).

[15] R. F. Werner, M. M. Wolf, *Quantum information & computation* **1** No.3, (2001).

[16] Tamas Vértesi, Nicolas Brunner, *Nature Communications* **5**, 5297 (2014).

[17] J. Tura, R. Augusiak, A. B. Sainz, T. Vertesi, M. Lewenstein, A. Acin Science **344**, 1256 (2014).

[18] E. Schrodinger, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 800, 823, 844 (1935); translation in Quantum Theory and Measurement, J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek, eds. (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983) , p. 152.

[19] R. T. Rockafellar, Convex Analysis (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ), p. 200 (1970).

[20] G. Bae, W. Son, arXiv:1407.1030 (2014).

[21] See supplimentary material.